REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated February 25, 1998. Claims 1-8, 10-14, 16-21 and 23 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 24, 26, 27 and 29 remain pending, with Claims 24 and 27 having been amended in terms which more clearly define the present invention. Claims 24 and 27 are independent. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

In the Office Action, Claims 1-8, 10-14, 16-21 and 23 were rejected over prior art. These claims have now been cancelled, rendering their rejections moot.

In the Office Action, Claims 24 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C.§ 103 over U.S. Patent No. 4,989,163 (Kawamata et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,727,435 (Otani et al.). Claim 26, which depends from Claim 24, and Claim 29, which depends from Claim 27, were rejected over Kawamata et al. in view of U.S. Patents Nos. 4,989,163 (Bushaw et al.) and 5,218,458 (Kochis et al.).

As shown above, Applicant has amended independent Claims 24 and 27 and submits that these claims, together with the remaining claims dependent thereon, are patentably distinct from the cited prior art for the following reasons.

The present invention as defined in amended Claim 24 is directed to an image processing device, comprising a scanner for inputting an image signal, an image processing circuit for performing image processing necessary for copying

on the image signal input from the scanner to provide a first processed image signal, a bidirectional interface for transmitting the image signal input by the scanner to an external computer, the external computer performing image processing necessary for copying on the transmitted image signal to provide a second processed image signal, the bidirectional interface receiving the second processed image signal from the external computer, and output means for outputting the first processed image signal or the second processed image signal.

In accordance with an advantageous aspect of the present invention, the device has a plurality of modes including first and second copying modes, the device interlockingly using the scanner, the bidirectional interface and the output means in the first copying mode to perform copying based on the second processed image signal, and interlockingly using the scanner, the image processing circuit and the output means in the second mode to perform copying based on the first processed image signal.

The Office Action cites to Kawamata et al. as teaching essentially all the structure of the prior claims, acknowledging that Kawamata et al. at least fails to disclose the first and second modes of Claims 24 and 27, and cites to Otani et al. as teaching a plurality of modes to process and output the image signal. Assuming that Kawamata in fact does disclose the structure of the prior claims and that Otani et

al. could be combined therewith, which Applicant does not concede, Applicant submits that Otani et al. fails to disclose the specific modes now more clearly recited in amended Claims 24 and 27.

In particular, the Office Action cites to the general statement of plural modes in Otani et al. in columns 1-2, and then cites to column 4, lines 5-20 for specific modes. However, while the off-line mode in column 4, lines 15-20 of Otani et al. may generally correspond to the second mode of Claims 24 and 27, the on-line mode in column 4, lines 7-15 does not correspond to the first mode of the claims. Rather, Otani et al.'s on-line mode simply transfers the image data to another designated information processing device. Applicant has found no teaching or suggestion in Otani et al. to modify its disclosed modes, and therefore submits that even the combination of Otani et al. with Kawamata et al. fails to suggest the present invention as defined in the amended claims.

Moreover, Applicant has now amended the structure recited in Claim 24 to operate interlockingly, as shown above. Applicant has not found a teaching of this feature in Kawamata et al.

Amended independent Claim 27 is a method claim corresponding to amended apparatus Claim 24, and is believed to be patentably distinct from the cited prior art for the same reasons.

Dependent Claims 26 and 29 were not rejected over the combination of Kawamata et al. with Otani et al. and other art, but rather the combination of Kawamata et al., Bushaw et al. and Kochis et al. If this combination does not render the independent Claims 24 and 27 obvious, then it cannot render their dependent claims obvious. Moreover, Bushaw et al. was cited as teaching a document distribution system and Kochis et al. was cited as teaching a modem. Applicant has found nothing in either reference to remedy the above-noted deficiencies of the combination of Kawamata et al. and Otani et al. as applied against the amended claims.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejections and to allow the amended claims.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should be directed to our new address given below.

Respectfully submitted,

Abigail Cousins

Attorney for Applicant

Registration No. 29,292

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

A:\862-1351.AMD/rmd